

REMARKS

As an initial matter, a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is filed herewith along with the required petition and fee. It is requested that the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement be considered and made of record.

Claim 1 was objected to for its use of “the input power” in the preamble. This was not an attempt to reference an antecedent term, but was intended to refer to an inherent property of an amplifier. While it was believed to be clear as written, as the examiner has suggested a minor change, the amendment has been made to render the issue moot.

Claim 6 stands rejected under § 112. The objection is made to the summing limitation. The question is asked, “Should it be summed to produce a single current?” This particular question is not understood. Currents are signals. This refers to the signal generated in the step of producing. The article “the” has been added in their amendment prior to “differential current”. The differential current is clearly defined in claim 6 and would have been understood by an artisan in any event because it is the sum of the first and the second currents. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection under § 112 be withdrawn.

The examiner’s indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-5, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 21 is acknowledged and appreciated.

Claims 1, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20 and 22 stand rejected under § 103 over Iga. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In stating the rejection with respect to claims 1, 9, 10 and 14, the examiner states that Iga discloses the claimed invention except for the “filter”. The examiner likens the mirror transistors in FIG. 2 to the corresponding elements of the claims that produce the differential current. Then the examiner concludes that the filter only enhances circuit performance and that clipping is a “design choice”. In the summary of the claims, many of the claim features are overlooked. The Iga reference is also interpreted incorrectly and the rejection is therefore improper.

First, the circuit in FIG. 2 of Iga is receiving clock signals as discussed in column 6, lines 29-36. Such clock signals for semiconductors should produce a constant

level output with the range of the semiconductor chip. The FIG. 2 circuit includes a bias circuit 20 that provides a bias potential to the nodes N1 and N2 to maintain the potential at “prescribed values regardless of the levels of input external signal and reference signal.” Column 6, lines 45-54.

Regarding claim 1, nothing in Iga accepts negative and positive input voltages of an RF amplifier. Nothing in Iga produces a differential current that is responsive to voltages of an RF amplifier. Also, the clipping is not a design choice. As discussed on page 4, lines 26-30, the inventors realize that the clipping under the specific conditions can provide for high average current responsive to level of input power. As pointed out in the beginning of page 5, this raises their average collector currents above acquiescence level.

For similar reasons, the differential power sensor means of claim 9 and means for summing the first and second currents of claim 13 are not disclosed. With respect to claim 13, there are currents that are responsive to both the positive and negative voltage phases of an RF amplifier and then the bias current is produced by a summing of those currents. No remotely similar operation is found in Iga. The examiner again points to the transistors QN1 and QN2 in a current mirror, but nothing associated with the bias circuit 20 corresponds to the particular currents defined in claim 13. The bias circuit instead receives a voltage reference and provides current as described in column 6, lines 45-54.

Separately, regarding the filtering in claim 1, claim 7, claim 8, and claim 10, the examiner concludes that this is design choice. However, while an RF amplifier is concerned with harmonics, there is no similar concern in the clock signals that are handled in the Iga reference. Accordingly, it is not clear how the filtering that is specifically claimed in these claims that relates to an RF amplifier could assist operation of the clock circuits of Iga.

For all of the above reasons, applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the application. Should the examiner believe that outstanding issues exist, they could be addressed in a telephone conference. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

/Steven P. Fallon/

By

Steven P. Fallon
Registration No. 35,132

October 13, 2008

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978